

REMARKS**I. Allowable Subject Matter:**

At page 9, item 5 of the Office Action, claims 17-19 are objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In response to the objection, the Applicants have amended claim 16 to include the limitations of claim 17, and claim 17 has been canceled.

Accordingly, the Applicants believe that claim 16, as well as dependent claims 18-26, are allowable and request that Examiner withdraw the objections to the claims.

II. Response to Rejections under 35 USC Section 112:

At page 2, item 2 of the Office Action, claim 14 is rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as being indefinite in that it fails to point out what is included or excluded by the claim language.

The Applicants have canceled claim 14.

Accordingly, the Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

III. Response to Rejections under 35 USC Section 102:

At page 2, item 4 of the Office Action, claims 1-16, and 20-26 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Reisman (US Patent Number 6,658,464). As claims 16-29 have been amended as previously identified in the Allowable Subject Matter section hereinabove, and wherein claim 14 is canceled, only claims 1-13 and 15 are discussed in this section.

In Reisman, user software that controls transport, storage, and presentation of content from a remote source is disclosed. Reisman includes a method for operating a user station that is configured for communications with a multiplicity of independently-operated data sources via a network. However, Reisman does not

disclose a method that includes instructions “which are interpreted to render an iconic selector associated with a service”, as recited in amended independent claim 1. Thus, the Applicants disagree with the Examiner’s assertion at page 3, lines 4 and 5 that the “automated object” of Reisman reads on the iconic selector of claim 1. The applicants assert that the “automated object” of Reisman *does not read on nor bear any resemblance* to the iconic selector shown in Figure 15. In the context of Reisman (such as at column 30, line 56), an “automated object” refers to a content object, such as “as information product content or software updates” as indicated at column 30, lines 50 and 51 of Reisman.


The iconic selector of claim 1 allows the user to receive available content (e.g., electronic publications, multimedia content, services, etc.), index available content, and/or automatically print available content without modifying the rendered content and *without requiring further user input* (as stated page 5, lines 27-30 of the specification). This capability is not disclosed in Reisman.

The Applicants stress that in view of the burden for a prima facie case of anticipation under §102, Reisman does not show or suggest each of the elements of claim 1. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

IV. Additional Fees:

It is not believed that additional fees are due at this time; however, if any additional fee is required in connection with the filing of this Amendment, please charge the fee to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully Submitted,
Pieter J. Van Zee et al

By: 
Jeff D. Limon
Agent for the Applicants
Registration Number 45,418

Hewlett-Packard Company
Legal Department
1000 NE Circle Blvd.
Corvallis, OR 97330
Telephone: (541) 715-5979
Fax: (541) 715-8581